

From: Pkramerbiz@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 12:15 PM
Subject: UNE-P

Dear Mr. Powell;

Just a couple points to ponder:

- 1) The RBOC's are claiming there is no money for network upgrades, nor any incentive to do so....yet they have spent millions on advertising and lobbying efforts. Could not this money have gone to better use?
- 2) Perhaps, if these companies would offer fair pricing to consumers coupled with treating the consumer in a manner most competitors treat them (i.e., without them, they do not have a reason to be), they would lose fewer customers to the competitors. The fewer customers they lose to competitors, means the fewer discounted elements they have to sell. Maybe this is too simple of a concept?

Sir, I speak to you not only as a consumer, but someone active in the industry. My comments come to you with first hand experience.

I see day in and day out how badly consumers are treated by SBC in our area. The single biggest reason customers switch to a competitor is that they are tired of the monopoly mentality.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 is not perfect and I believe was heavily influenced by a handful of people who stood to profit directly. It should be modified, but not to sacrifice competition.

Sincerely,

Pamela R. Kramer

From: Gregory MacPherson
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 3:35 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Gregory MacPherson (neil3@swbell.net) writes:

Gee, thanks so much for your lack of vision in supporting the antiquated, outmoded regulation now in place in the telecommunications industry. Working people in the entire industry are suffering through loss of jobs because of your short-sightedness. Notice the market is way down again today because you left status-quo a very trouble industry!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 144.160.98.28
Remote IP address: 144.160.98.28

From: Doug McKee
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 8:55 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Doug McKee (dcmckee@ies.net) writes:

As a small ISP in SBC territory, we are terrified concerning todays vote.
If Commissioner Powell wins the day it will be giving the hen house to the foxes.
The Bells have not made any real progress in broadband that was not forced upon them by competition
and will not do so in the future unless they have to.

Regards,
Doug McKee COO
South Texas Internet

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 67.99.45.159
Remote IP address: 67.99.45.159

From: oralia
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 3:22 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

oralia (elpuente@swbell.net) writes:

Those of us who unwittingly have heralded democrats for years, believing that our interests (The American workers) were best served by the democratic party, need to start looking to republicans to protect the economic future of this country.

Your vote today will cause thousands of americans to lose their jobs and thier futures.

Yesterday our jobs were in jeopardy, but there was hope. Today you've have made certain that we have no future.

So while you and the business interests that you serve pat yourselves on the back for you decison, remember those of us who will be facing the unemployment lines tomorrow.

W

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 208.191.179.221
Remote IP address: 208.191.179.221

From: John Owens
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 10:56 PM
Subject: UNE-P

To whom it may concern,

I am a twenty-five year old man with a wife and a five month old daughter. I work for one of the incumbent telephone companies, and have read what came from the ruling today of UNE-P. I have a opinion I feel needs to be passed on.

Telecommunications have been my field since college. I feel very fortunate, and lucky to have this job, and would love to finish my career in this field. This is the reason I fealt compelled to write you.

Since I began this job three years ago, I have already seen alot of job cuts. I feel this is largely due to forced non-profit wholeselling of our networks. I work outside in the field, and see where funds need to go toward new and updated technology, but I also see why the company cannot afford the new facilities.

To my knowledge the UNE-P was to give new companies a chance to build their own facilities and create fair competition. This does not seem to be happening. Constantly my wife and I see advertisements on t.v. for new telephone companies. The very next day I go to my job, and work on lines for customers that say they switched companies. They always want to know why we are still working on the lines.

The main point I am trying to make is about my job. When my company needs to make more cuts because of profit loss it will hit the workers like me. Where will I go? There will not be another telecom job where my trade will be needed, because the CLEC gets the service from ILEC, therefore they do not need employees.

Sincerely,
A concerned citizen

From: Kathy Rios
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 1:56 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Kathy Rios (krios@qwest.com) writes:

I hope you will support Sect. 251 today.
We are trying our very best to serve our
customers well and provide the best service
possible. Thank you. Kathy Rios

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 199.168.32.10
Remote IP address: 199.168.32.10

From: Robert Rutschow
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 7:03 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Robert Rutschow (rutschow@yahoo.com) writes:

That was the worst decision in the history of telephones. You truly voted like someone who has never used the internet. Don't you realize that telecom spending, and hence a better internet that doesn't crash and isn't so slow, is dependent on being able to make money on those capital expenditures to improve it? I guess you don't understand that. Companies should just spend money and not expect any return, right? Just awful. Thanks for the lasting telecom depression you just ensured. The people you thought you saved \$2 a year in phone costs will really appreciate being out of work and not having a phone at all.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.42.51.27
Remote IP address: 12.42.51.27

From: Bentley Stracener
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 6:39 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Bentley Stracener (bstracen@yahoo.com) writes:

As a 29 year employee of SBC let me say how disappointed i am in your vote. You have effectively stifled capital expenditures and employment opportunities for 177,000 employees. The late hours you spoke of seem meaningless compared to those spent by decent hard working men and women who are unemployed. People who spent their entire working life building the backbone of this communications network. This decision will undoubtedly be overturned in court. Perhaps then you will realize what an error you have made. Until then, telephone workers all across America will continue to see investment dwindle and jobs lost. None of which is of much concern to you.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 144.160.98.29
Remote IP address: 144.160.98.29

From: David scott
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 10:25 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

David scott (dns2@alltel.net) writes:

Shame on you for what you are doing to the phone companies. Your postion is wrong wrong wrong Would you do the same thing to Walmart. Many people are losing their jobs because of you Support Chairman Powell I am a democrat

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 144.160.5.22
Remote IP address: 144.160.5.22

From: Mike Scime
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 6:56 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Mike Scime (l8pasta@ameritech.net) writes:

Horrible Telecom. Ruling. You miss the true meaning of competition. Your decision will stifle investment, jobs, research, growth and stock health. Do you really know what you consented to here or are you playing politics?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 65.42.109.157
Remote IP address: 65.42.109.157

From: Russell Stanley
To: Russell Stanley
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 12:55 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator DeWine
Senator Voinovich
Representative Ryan
Message text follows:

Russell Stanley
4470 Cottage Grove Rd
Uniontown, OH 44685-9657

February 20, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Russ Stanley

From: Jesse Travis
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 11:15 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Jesse Travis (jessejames956@hotmail.com) writes:

I am writing to express my severe disapproval with the commissions ruling today concerning the network unbundling obligations of the incumbent local phone carriers. I can't help but feel as though the voting public, all of which rely on the US telecommunications system, was shafted in a senseless game of politics carried out in poor taste and with little regard to what was in the best interest of the American consumer.

I cannot fathom how you and your colleagues came to an agreement that UNE-P is a practice worth continuing. Any regulation which would require a company to open its network to its competitors at rates below cost is archaic and of ill-cause. How anyone could sit and with clear conscious decide that such a practice is fair and just is beyond me.

Perhaps some sense did come from the decision in regards to broadband and fiber, but even so it seemed like a watered-down compromise, not nearly enough positive to balance out the negative impact your senseless ruling will cause.

It is my sincere hope that in the future you do not let any political or personal agenda cloud your efforts to do what is best for the American people and the economy that is so dependent on the telecommunications industry. I will continue to pray for God's guidance in your life and your decision making.

Very deeply disappointed,

Jesse J. Travis

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.71.64.123
Remote IP address: 65.71.64.123

From: Michael Wolff
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 6:37 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Michael Wolff (wolffs@ameritech.net) writes:

I am extremely dissappointed with your lack of vision regarding UNE-P relief for the regional Bell companies. You have shown your ignorance regarding true competition vs. UNE-P. As an employee of SBC I look forward to a continued depressed corporate outlook while AT&T and WorldCom enjoy the revenue that my company rightfully has earned. I hope you enjoy a continued depressed economy, stock market as we will continue our substantial reductions in Capital expenditures thanks to your misguided opinion. What lobbyists do you accept money from? I am pretty sure I could guess.

Disgusted in Wisconsin

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 144.160.5.21
Remote IP address: 144.160.5.21

From: Jane Waldron
To: Jane Waldron
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 1:16 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Murray
Senator Cantwell
Representative Dunn
Message text follows:

Jane Waldron
19610 166St. E.
Sumner, WA 98390-7310

February 20, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Jane Waldron

From: James Ward
To: James Ward
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 11:48 AM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator DeWine

Senator Voinovich

Representative Strickland

Message text follows:

James Ward
111 Twp. Rd. 615
South Point, OH 45680-7290

February 20, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

James A. Ward

From: Greg.Wrenn@sungard.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 12:42 PM
Subject: FCC Phone Decision

I would like to request you all vote to do away with the competition rules that require phone companies to share transmission lines with their competitors. The Bell companies are having to lease their lines and equipment to their competitors for below cost. This makes no sense and has out lived any good it provided.

Please remove this restriction on the Bells.

Thanks for your time,
Greg Wrenn

From: Melvin Weinstein
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 2:37 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Melvin Weinstein (mewpclaw@bellsouth.net) writes:

Mr. Adelstein: I am devastated by the FCC's decision today to eliminate line sharing. Don't you understand that broadband is what it's all about today. The FCC's decision means that all broadband users will have to migrate to the RBOCs in the next 3 years. Is that supposed to maintain or increase competition? Maybe they teach economics 101 differently at Stanford. I just do not understand how you and Commissioner Kopps could have agreed to this decision.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.154.42.108
Remote IP address: 68.154.42.108

From: Vern Weller
To: Vern Weller
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 3:39 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Levin

Senator Stabenow

Representative Stupak

Message text follows:

Vern Weller

7777 Glenbeigh lane, P. O. Box 327
Eastport, MI 49627

February 20, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Vern D. Weller

From: Randal Vest
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 6:37 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Randal Vest (rvest@prodigy.net) writes:

Read your comments on todays order and you are so much a Democrat, rather than a fair commisioner. Sure consumers are better off under the current rules since ATT and the WorlCom cheats can buy and sell below actual costs of local service. If you forced MCDonalds to whosale Big Macs for 10c to anyone who wanted to step behind the counter and sell them for a small markup, consumers would benefit there also. Of course MCDonalds would unfairly go broke.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.154.230.46
Remote IP address: 64.154.230.46

From: You are evil
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 10:28 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

You are evil (paul@stlgeek.net) writes:

You are an evil person! By passing this latest broadband thing, you and your associates have helped to destroy my company! I am a small service provider, I get my internet for a VERY low price through a 3rd party (bell->covad->provider->me). Whenever this thing goes into effect it will DEEPLY impact many small internet based companies. Thanks a lot, you evil little thing you.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.102.147.147
Remote IP address: 12.102.147.147